

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 are amended. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in Fig. 1 and on page 10, lines 3-11, for example. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the remarks below is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Getaneh at the interview held September 8, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action objects to claim 5. The amendment to claim 5 obviates the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0170973 to Teraura in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137680 to Maruoka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes, on page 3, that Teraura does not explicitly teach that the history contained in the second parameter includes at least a size change of the image formed on the recording medium. The Office Action asserts that Maruoka supplies the missing subject matter. As discussed during the personal interview, Maruoka does not disclose, and would not have suggested, that the history contained in the second parameter includes information indicating a previous printing of the image formed on the recording medium in an n-up print mode, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 3, 7 and 9.

Maruoka is directed to printing on a same type of recording medium (printing paper) as was used previously (paragraph [0009]). However, Maruoka only discloses storing the sizes of various kinds of paper in paper information table 41 (paragraphs [0073] and [0077]).

Maruoka does not disclose, and would not have suggested, that the history contained in the second parameter includes information indicating a previous printing of the image formed on the recording medium in an n-up print mode, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 3, 7 and 9. Further, Teraura is not applied in any manner that would overcome the above-identified shortfall in the application of Maruoka to the subject matter recited in claims 1, 3, 7 and 9.


During the personal interview, Applicants' representative traversed the rejections in arguments not based on claim amendments. Examiner Getaneh indicated that while the passages of Maruoka cited in the Office Action did not appear to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in the previously presented independent claims, other passages in Maruoka may disclose this subject matter. Accordingly, Examiner Getaneh indicated that further consideration of Maruoka and possible search would be required upon receiving a Request for Reconsideration. Examiner Getaneh further indicated that, while the applied references do not appear to disclose that the history contained in the second parameter includes information indicating a previous printing of the image formed on the recording medium in an n-up print mode, this feature was not recited in the claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are amended to further recite the above-discussed feature.

In view of the above, Maruoka and Teraura, individually or in combination, do not disclose, and would not have suggested, the subject matter recited in claims 1, 3, 7 and 9. Thus, Maruoka and Teraura, individually or in combination, would not have taught or suggested the combinations of features recited in claims 2, 5, 8 and 10 for at least the dependence of these claims on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking  
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/acd

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: September 22, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461